

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JANUARY 24, 2006
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Speaker #2

Margaret Tweet, commented on consent agenda item 1 (resolution related to the process for making appointments to various boards and commissions serving Clark County). Mrs. Tweet stated that her recommendation was not considered in terms of ensuring that current elected Commissioners make appointments versus outgoing board members and she hoped the board would reconsider that in the resolution. She added that the open process was an improvement. Tweet then referenced the PDC complaint she filed against the county for using public resources to influence a campaign for a candidate or ballot measure and wanted to know if the board had discussed this issue yet, since Commissioner Morris had indicated they would have discussion in January.

Barron responded that they've not yet had discussions, but could certainly put it on the agenda.

Boldt said they would do so.

Tweet asked that she be notified.

Speaker #3

Shareefah Abdullah, Owner and President, Hot Ovations Communications Coaching and Training Company, and Founder/Facilitator of Black Entrepreneurs of Clark County, commented on equal employment opportunities with Clark County. Ms. Abdullah referenced the three suggestions she brought forward at the board's hearing of November 1, 2005: (1) conduct EEO audits of Clark County government; (2) to provide training for commissioners, administrator, directors, and other staff, on appropriate equal employment opportunity compliance; (3) provided aggressive recruitment of minority applicants and candidates. She said these recommendations would help start the process toward providing equal employment opportunity and that she was looking forward to working with the county beginning in the early part of this year to institute those practices.

Boldt said they looked forward to meeting with Ms. Abdullah personally.

CONSENT AGENDA

There being no public comment, **MOVED** by Stuart to approve items 1 through 11.
Commissioners Boldt, Stuart, and Morris voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 252)

CONSIDER A RESOLUTION DISBANDING THE CLARK COUNTY BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD

Bronson Potter, Prosecuting Attorney's Office, explained that the resolution before the board would disband the Boundary Review Board (BRB) for Clark County pursuant to RCW

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JANUARY 24, 2006
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

county, to facilitate the possible annexation and they would like to know what would happen with that. Also, Fire District's 1 and 9 had anticipated bringing before the BRB the possible merger of the two districts for reasons of efficiency and cost savings. He said if the BRB is abolished, he hoped there were alternatives in terms of service delivery and efficiencies in government.

James Howsley, Miller Nash, 500 E Broadway, Suite 400, Vancouver, described his experience working with the City of Camas on a couple of annexations. Mr. Howsley said it was his understanding that the Boundary Review Board was a process set up pre-GMA and meant to facilitate logical expansion so that cities would not grow beyond their ability to serve with sewer and water. He said that because there is now a new process under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to set urban growth areas and set those logical limits, it seems the need for the BRB has eroded. He said he was concerned about Gathe's comments suggesting that the cities in Clark County may not have adopted comprehensive plans or critical areas ordinances. Howsley stated that they are required to do so by the GMA and that each city and the county have had comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to the GMA since 1994 and those have since been updated. He further explained. He stated that this process just adds additional time and expense to property owners, staff, and the small cities. He asked the board to support the resolution.

Bridget Schwarz, Ridgefield, noted that the Neighborhood Association's Council of Clark County (NACCC) met with officials from the City of Vancouver to discuss the proposed expansion of the annexation area. Ms. Schwarz said the general feeling was that the answers they got from the City of Vancouver were less than satisfactory. She said they advised city officials that they need to do a lot more to involve the public in the process and take more time to work on their proposal for the cities and then give them feedback. She said the NACCC had drafted a letter to inform the City of Vancouver that they have met again to discuss the alternatives and are proposing that they withdraw the expansion area and only proceed with the Burnt Bridge Creek area. Schwarz added that she personally felt that all three county commissioners need to be involved before reaching a decision.

Boldt asked Mr. Potter about the pending annexations and what would happen if they approved the resolution.

Potter responded that with respect to the four pending annexation proposals, including the Burnt Bridge Creek proposal, the other annexation proposals are in the 20-30 acre range and the BRB review authority has not been invoked in any of the other annexation proposals, although there is still time remaining in which that jurisdiction could be invoked. The statute doesn't require that pending proposals be resolved prior to disbanding and he said that essentially disbanding the BRB removes a step in the process. He said the Burnt Bridge Creek proposal, which as proposed is 823 acres, could proceed to be considered by the city council

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JANUARY 24, 2006
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

He referenced pre-GMA areas such as Orchards, Hazel Dell, Salmon Creek, and Felida, which were urban long before the GMA, and said citizens living in those areas need to be asked what they think. Stuart stated that there are reasons to disband the BRB that have nothing to do with the Burnt Bridge annexation and he would have much rather talked about disbanding the BRB outside of the pressure of this specific annexation. He said he didn't agree with the idea of taking a small annexation proposal where petitions have been signed and using that small wedge to annex an enormous area. Why was that not considered inappropriate? Stuart said he was supportive of the annexation and willing to work with city officials to make the case for how the people living in that area would benefit. He said today's action would simply ensure a voice for the people. He said he was sorry it came to this point and would have rather had everyone come together to discuss moving forward in a methodical fashion. However, without a guarantee to the people who live there, he didn't feel comfortable leaving it to chance as to whether the BRB would or would not have expanded the area into thousands of acres and without asking the affected citizens. He referenced the Cascade Park annexation.

Potter said that Cascade Park was expanded beyond the original proposal, but prior to that occurring the city and the county got together before going to the BRB and adopted transition and interlocal agreements to provide for how services and revenues would be transitioned in that annexation, which was a 100% increase in the size of the annexation.

Stuart wanted to know what the percentage for the Burnt Bridge Creek annexation would be.

Potter said the proposal is for 823 acres and the expansion is for 16,000 acres.

Stuart stated that he would agree to the resolution. As far as Commissioner Morris not being present, anyone who reads the paper knows that she has been incredibly involved in this process and her voice has been heard on this and would continue to be heard. He said that it's time to stop being personal and to get to work as a council and commission to figure out ways to move forward together.

Boldt agreed with Commissioner Stuart and also echoed his comments regarding Commissioner Morris, who has been passionate about this issue. He acknowledged the incredible amount of work done by the BRB and said this was nothing against anything they've done. Boldt said regardless of the future annexation of Vancouver, he thought it still would have come to this point. He noted that there is currently legislation in Olympia regarding boundary review boards and if it's worked out, there was no reason they couldn't go back to a BRB in the future. He said they are committed to the process and want to be cooperative with the city. He said they pledge their support to work with the city to gather petitions and support for annexations. Boldt referenced the Cascade Park annexation and said the county and city agreed to the annexation. He said they have to know that when an annexation happens it will benefit the city's long-term goals and the county would always provide the best health and social services they can. He said

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JANUARY 24, 2006
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

